

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 3 and 5 through 10 remain pending in the present application. Claim 4 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 8 and 9 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, drawings and claims as originally filed.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 through 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, alleging them to be indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended Claim 1 to overcome the Examiner's alleged vagueness. Claim 4 has been cancelled. Accordingly, this objection is moot. Claim 8 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Claim 9 has been amended to provide proper antecedent basis. Accordingly, Applicant believes all claims to overcome the Examiner's §112 rejection and respectfully requests withdrawal of the same.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and (e)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 through 4, 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by the Battig application. Also, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1 through 3 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ochi et al.

Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 1 clearly defines the slide passages. One slide passage is open at a lower position and the other slide passage is open at a side position. The axes of the slide passages are about perpendicular to one another.

The Battig et al and Ochi et al references fail to disclose or suggest Applicant's invention. The Battig reference has passages which are angled at 45° and 180° with

respect to one another. The Ochi reference illustrates passages whose axes are parallel to one another. Accordingly, both of these references fail to disclose or suggest Applicant's invention. Having the passages, as claimed, enables the vehicle mounted unit to gradually move laterally on one bolt while it is rotated on a second bolt so that the vehicle mounted unit can be removed from the stud bolts in a direction perpendicular to the axes of the bolts. Neither of the references cited by the Examiner provide for such a feature. In fact, the cited references do not enable the devices to be removed perpendicular to the axes of the bolts.

Accordingly, Applicant believes Claim 1 to be patentably distinguishable over the Battig and Ochi et al references. Likewise, Claims 2, 3 and 5 through 10, which depend from Claim 1, are patentably distinct over the art cited by the Examiner.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 5, 6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Battig in view of Welch.

Claim 1 has been amended as described above. The combination of the Welch reference with Battig fails to overcome the deficiencies of the Battig reference. Thus Claims 5, 6 and 10 are patentably distinguishable over the Examiner's combination.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 8 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Battig et al. As mentioned above, the Battig reference fails to disclose or suggest Applicant's invention.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to pass the case to issue at the Examiner's earliest possible

convenience. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present application, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

W. R. Duke Taylor
Reg. No. 31,306

Dated: December 30, 2004

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

WRDT/jp